

**REMARKS**

Applicants and Applicants' representative thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the personal interview of July 31, 2003.

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak.

Claims 10 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,429,907 B1 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '907").

Claims 5-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,439 B1 to Noriyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,411,347 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '347") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,439 B1 to Noriyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,411,347 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '347") and U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,745 to Kawano.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,429,907 B1 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '907") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak.

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claim 1 has been amended to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are presently pending for consideration.

**A Certified Copy of the Priority Document Is Filed Herewith**

Applicants file herewith a certified copy of the priority document. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request acknowledgement that the certified copy was filed.

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak. Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-4 should be withdrawn since Kwak does not teach or suggest all of the features recited in claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites pixel electrodes respectively arranged in corresponding pixel areas such that each pixel electrode is substantially bilaterally symmetric about a vertical reference line crossing the center of the respectively corresponding pixel area in a direction of the data lines, amongst other features. As discussed during the July 31, 2003 personal interview, Applicants respectfully submit that Kwak does not have a pixel electrode substantially bilaterally symmetric about a vertical reference line crossing the center of a pixel area in a direction of the data lines. As can be clearly seen in FIG. 10 of Kwak, the pixel electrode 500, which overlies adjacent gate lines 100, is not symmetric about a vertical reference line crossing the center of the pixel area in a direction of the data lines 200. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully submit that Kwak does not teach or suggest a pixel electrode substantially bilaterally symmetric about a vertical reference line crossing the center of a pixel area in a direction of the data lines. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2-4 are allowable at least because of their dependencies on claim 1 and for the additional features that claims 2-4 recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1-4 be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,439 B1 to Noriyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,411,347 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '347") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 5,825,439 B1 to Noriyama and U.S. Patent No. 6,411,347 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '347") and U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,677,745 to Kawano. As discussed during the personal interview of July 31, 2003, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 5-7 and 9 should be withdrawn since neither Noriyama, Park '347, Kwak nor Kawano teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, all of the features recited in claim 5. Independent claim 5 recites, amongst other features, that each of the pixel areas includes a pair of a first projection and a second projection projecting from an adjacent scan line at one side. The Office Action refers to FIG. 10 of Kwak with regard to a teaching of a first projection and second projection.

As set forth in the personal interview of July 31, 2003, Applicants respectfully assert that Kwak does not teach or suggest a pair of a first projection and a second projection projecting

from an adjacent scan line at one side in a pixel area. Further, Applicants submit that neither Noriyama nor Park '347 teach or suggest a pair of a first projection and a second projection projecting from an adjacent scan line at one side in a pixel area. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that Noriyama, Park '347 and Kwak do not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, a pair of a first projection and a second projection projecting from an adjacent scan line at one side in a pixel area, as recited in claim 5. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 6-9 are allowable at least because of their dependence on claim 5 and for the additional features that claims 6-9 recite. Further, Kawano does not make for the deficiencies of Noriyama, Park '347 and Kwak. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 5-9 be withdrawn.

Claims 10 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,429,907 B1 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '907"). Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 10 and 13-20 should be withdrawn since Park '907 does not teach or suggest, either separately or in combination, all of the features recited in claim 10. Independent claim 10 recites, amongst other features, a pixel electrode having a pattern configured to yield substantially the same capacitance value for capacitors that are formed between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on one side and between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on another side. As explained during the July 31, 2003 personal interview, Park '907 does not disclose an electrode having a pattern configured to yield substantially the same capacitance value for capacitors that are formed between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on one side and between the pixel

electrode and the adjacent data line on another side. Applicants also respectfully submit that Park '907 does not have any disclosure with regard to capacitors formed between a pixel electrode and both of the adjacent data lines.

As pointed out in the July 31, 2003 personal interview, Park '907 only discloses a pixel electrode that overlaps only one of the adjacent data lines. Since Park '907 has no disclosure with regard to capacitors between a pixel electrode and both of the adjacent data lines, Park '907 can not anticipate a pixel electrode having a pattern configured to yield substantially the same capacitance value for capacitors that are formed between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on one side and between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on another side. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 11-20 are allowable at least because of their dependencies on claim 10 and for the additional features that claims 11-20 recite. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 10 and 13-20 be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,429,907 B1 to Park et al. (hereinafter referred to as "Park '907") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,384,878 B1 to Kwak. Claims 11 and 12 are dependent upon claim 10, which claim 10 recites, amongst other features, a pixel electrode having a pattern configured to yield substantially the same capacitance value for capacitors that are formed between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on one side and between the pixel electrode and the adjacent data line on another side. As discussed above, Park '907 does not teach or suggest at least these features. Further, Kwak does not make for the deficiencies of Park '907. Accordingly,

dependent claims 11 and 12, which depend from claim 10, are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10, and for the additional features that they recite.

**CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: August 11, 2003

By:   
Donald L. Monin, Jr.  
Reg. No. 47,256

Customer No.: 009629  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: 202-739-3000  
Facsimile: 202-739-3001